



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The Political History of Virginia during the Reconstruction.

By HAMILTON JAMES ECKENRODE. Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science, series xxii, nos. 6, 7, 8. Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1904.—128 pp.

This latest monograph on the period of Reconstruction traces the steps by which Virginia was brought back into the Union. Beginning with the revolt of Virginia's western counties in 1861, the author briefly describes the erection of the "reorganized government of Virginia" under Pierpont, its career in western Virginia and at Alexandria, the formation of the new state of West Virginia, and the situation at the close of the war. Succeeding chapters outline the political activities in Virginia under the plans of Johnson and of Congress, the political influence of the Freedmen's Bureau and the Union League, the convention of 1868, and the restoration of the state in 1870.

The position of Virginia in 1865 was in some respects unlike that of other southern states. No provisional government was set up. According to the logic of the situation, Virginia should have been restored when Pierpont moved to Richmond; but Pierpont's government was not sufficiently radical to suit Congress. With few exceptions it was made up originally of northern men; but the latter were overwhelmed by the native whites, as a result of the amnesty proclamation of May 29, 1865, and the nature of the provisional government changed. It fell into the hands of moderates, while its former radical supporters now became more radical, hostile to the state government and friendly toward negro suffrage, which alone would return them to power.

Clearly and concisely the author describes the political development from 1865 to 1870: the gradual formation of two parties, the one radical, based on the support of the blacks, the other conservative, and opposed to the political equality of the blacks; the division in the Republican ranks between extreme radicals and moderates; the attempt and failure of the old Whigs to influence the negroes; the reaction against the radical program and the fusion of the conservatives and the moderates of both parties, resulting in the restoration of the state. There is no account of the social and economic aspects of the Reconstruction: only its superficial political features are described. Some statements and conclusions of the author are worthy of note. He shows that the Republican party in the state was opposed to negro suffrage as long as it seemed possible to disfranchise the mass of the whites. He answers the wearisome question, why the respectable whites did not try to control the negro voters instead of leaving them to unscrupulous aliens, by

showing that a serious attempt was made to do this, and that it was repulsed with scorn by the blacks, who at the very beginning had fallen under outside control. It was generally believed that the former owners would control the blacks; but the latter were rendered suspicious and independent of the whites by the Freedmen's Bureau, while the Union League united them in a strong political organization and taught them to hate and fear the whites.

The radical leaders succeeded so well that to the convention of 1868, composed of 95 delegates, a solid negro vote sent 72 delegates, pledged to radical policies. Of these, 24 were negroes, 13 were native whites, and the rest were carpet-baggers. Though the negro failed to secure social-equality legislation, the constitution contained sweeping provisions for disfranchisement of whites. The radical nature of this instrument, the lack of funds, the proximity of the state to Washington, which rendered misgovernment too visible, and the fact that the vote of Virginia was not needed to elect the president, caused the authorities to defer the vote on the constitution until a more favorable time, and the worst provisions were then voted down. But there was carpet-bag government in 1868 and 1869 under the provisional regime, Congress having decreed that all officials must take the "iron-clad test oath." Of course few decent people could take it.

On some matters the author's theories and opinions may be criticised. If party distinctions had faded out in Virginia in 1865, then Virginia was unlike other southern states. Too much importance is ascribed to the effect on Congress of the state legislation affecting freedmen. The views accepted are those of Mr. Blaine and others who were searching for excuses for the course of Congress. Congress had decided to reject the president's plan before the so-called "black laws" were passed. They served later as convenient excuses for what had been done. The laws, with few exceptions, were timely and sensible, and in substance had long been and still are on the statute books of most of the states of the Union. It is also a mistake to attribute any great importance to the adverse testimony of the Virginia witnesses who came before the Committee on Reconstruction. The committee was in quest of testimony to support a course already decided upon, and the witnesses were carefully selected with that end in view. Again, the author is wrong in ascribing to the northern people generally an enthusiasm for the rights of man and an acceptance of the doctrine of the social and political equality of the races. Reconstruction was only partially due to humanitarian motives; it was for the most part cold-blooded, practical politics. Moreover, in view of the state of politics at that time, it was not necessary to

criticise Virginia for refusing to ratify the Fourteenth Amendment. To have done so would have added another humiliation. Further, popular education is a partial success in Virginia, not because of, but in spite of, the reconstructionists. As to the results of Reconstruction, the author accepts the apologetic view that it secured the negro's personal freedom, his economic independence, and his right to vote and to educate his children. Exactly how this was done we are not told. It is not correct to look upon the recent disfranchisement movement as entirely opposed to the political rights of the negro; it is more correct to say that in the new constitutions the whites for the first time freely admit the right of the capable black men, distinguishing these from the unfit, and thus recognize negro suffrage.

On the whole, Mr. Eckenrode has produced a good account of politics in Virginia during Reconstruction; but in interpreting the facts he is too much influenced by the memoir writers and the apologists.

WALTER L. FLEMING.

WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY.

The Color Line. A Brief in Behalf of the Unborn. By WILLIAM BENJAMIN SMITH. New York, McClure, Phillips & Co., 1905.—xv, 261 pp.

This book is an attempt to present and to defend the position assumed by most southern whites that the color line between the races must be maintained firmly and unflinchingly as the only barrier against miscegenation and consequent debasement of the South. "The supreme and all-overshadowing importance of preserving the American-Caucasian blood pure and untainted and dedicated to the development of the highest humanity" is "the central position" of the book (p. 158). This claim the author thinks challenged or denied in act by the entertainment of a negro at lunch by the president, and in word or implication by the attitude of the North and of Europe (pp. 1, 21). He affirms "that the highest authorities in the North, the factors that form public opinion and guide legislation, have never yet to our knowledge raised their voices against miscegenation in the South" (pp. 71 *et seq.*). In answer to this one may quote from the president's speech in New York City, Feb. 13, 1905: "All reflecting men of both races are united in feeling that race purity must be preserved." But waiving the question whether Professor Smith is correct in his belief that public opinion at the North or in Europe favors or is indifferent to miscegenation, we pass to a consideration of the arguments upon which his position is based. The inferiority of the negro because of his racial inheritance